

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that it is unusual, to say the least, for two Senators from the same State to differ on projects of this matter. I am sorry that seems to be the case here. But let me say in conclusion and in summary that there are 571 Federal wildlife refuges in the Nation but not one in Kentucky. We are long overdue for our first Federal wildlife refuge. This proposal was developed over a number of years in cooperation with the Kentucky Fish and Wildlife Service, and over 57 sportsmen and conservation groups from across Kentucky feel that this great need should be met.

No land under this proposal will be taken from anyone—only from willing sellers. It is my hope, Mr. President, that this proposal authorizing and appropriating some money to begin Kentucky's first Federal wildlife refuge will be a part of the Interior appropriations bill.

I hope my colleague will not offer an amendment to strip out the money provided—whatever money is ultimately provided—for this first Federal wildlife refuge in order to give it to the Tennessee Valley Authority which says it does not need it.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. I know there are a number of Members who are waiting and wondering what the schedule might be for the remainder of the evening. We are working very aggressively to try to come to a unanimous consent agreement that would allow us to go forward with amendments and debate on those amendments tonight and complete those amendments tonight, if we could get this agreement worked out, with the votes stacked beginning at 10 o'clock on Friday morning.

We are still working with Members on both sides. I think it is, frankly, urgent that we go ahead and get this agreement entered into momentarily. We are very close to that. But as usual, we are trying to check with all the Senators who are interested in the subject matter to see if we can get that worked out.

In the meantime, Mr. President, before I do a statement, let me again observe the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 1174

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of S. 1174, regarding the Lamprey River in New Hampshire, the bill be advanced to third reading and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, speaking on behalf of the leader on our side, I reserve the right to object.

I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would amend his request to include the following: That the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 599, S. 608, that the committee amendments be agreed to, the bill be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leadership, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, do I still have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I do not know about the other bill that was attempted to be added to my request for consideration of a bill, but I would just like my colleagues to know that this bill, S. 1174, passed unanimously out of committee with bipartisan support. It was placed on the calendar by the majority leader. It has the unanimous support of everyone on the Republican side. It has the support of my State of New Hampshire. It has the support of the individuals who helped to put this river into the wild and scenic bill. It is 12 miles of a beautiful river that we now preserve under the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, if this legislation passes.

I find it outrageous that, for whatever reasons, political or otherwise, a piece of legislation that has that much support would be objected to; tying it, linking it to some other legislation. I think the other legislation can rise or fall on its own merit. This is a good bill.

Mr. President, on August 10, 1995, Senator GREGG and I introduced S. 1174, the Lamprey Wild and Scenic River Act, to designate a segment of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as part of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Since introduction, a hearing was held on the legislation in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and soon thereafter, as I

said, the bill was reported unanimously out of the committee.

I introduced this legislation after receiving the vote of support from each of the affected communities along this segment of the River. Ordinarily I do not encourage Federal ownership and control of State or private property, however, this legislation is different.

The process for developing this legislation was different for two reasons. First, the legislation was developed from the bottom up, from environmentally conscious communities and local people. It is not a Washington initiative. Second, the bill is drafted to allow for maximum control at the local level in making land use and conservation decisions.

The history of this legislation goes back almost 5 years when Senator Rudman and I introduced the Lamprey River study bill in February 1991, which was subsequently signed into law by President Bush later that year. Once the National Park Service determined the Lamprey River's eligibility for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, a local advisory committee was formed to work with local communities, landowners, the National Park Service and New Hampshire's environment department in preparing a comprehensive management plan. This management plan was completed in January 1995.

The Lamprey River Management Plan was subsequently endorsed by the advisory committee as well as the local governments affected by this designation. The primary criteria for my sponsorship of this legislation was the support of the local communities. If the affected towns did not vote in favor of designation, I would not be here today seeking support for this legislation.

In fact, the town of Epping had expressed some reservation about designating the segment of the Lamprey which runs through the town and, out of respect for their concerns, the bill excludes that segment of the river. However, that segment was studied and found to be eligible, so we have included a section in our bill that would allow the town of Epping to be involved in the implementation of the management plan and, upon the town's request, be considered for future designation.

The Lamprey River is well deserving of this designation for a number of reasons. Not only is the river listed on the 1982 National Park Service's inventory of outstanding rivers, but it has also been recognized by the State of New Hampshire as the "most important coastal river for anadromous fish in the State." Herring, Shad and Salmon are among the anadromous species found in the river. In fact, New Hampshire fishing maps describe the Lamprey as "a truly exceptional river offering a vast variety of fishing. It contains every type of stream and river fish you could expect to find in New England."

The Lamprey is approximately 60 miles in length and serves as the major

tributary for the Great Bay, which is part of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. The Great Bay Refuge is also nearby, which was established several years ago following the closure of Pease Air Force Base. The preservation of the Lamprey is a significant component to protecting this entire ecosystem.

The 11.5-mile segment, as proposed by our legislation, has been the focus of local protection efforts for many years. The towns of Lee, Durham, and Newmarket, local conservationists, the State government, as well as the congressional delegation have all come together in support of this legislation. I believe the management philosophy adopted by the Advisory Committee best articulates our goals for this legislation:

... management of the river must strike a balance among desires to protect the river as an ecosystem, maintain the river for legitimate community use, and protect the interests and property rights of those who own its shorelands.

I just cannot understand why, at this hour, with all the work and all of the background, that the other side would play politics on this issue. It is an outrage. I think everybody should know it. I hope the people in New Hampshire hear me and know it, that this very significant piece of environmental legislation is being deliberately held up for whatever purposes. I will leave people to decide.

But I do want to recognize two members of the Lamprey River Advisory Committee, Judith Spang of Durham, NH, and Richard Wellington of Lee, NH, who worked so hard and so long to pass this legislation.

I might say to them, I apologize to you for the outrage that is being committed here on the floor of the Senate tonight. This is not the way we should do business in the U.S. Senate. This is an environmentally sound piece of legislation. It has the support of the communities, support of the State, support of every single Republican on my side, the support of most Democrats on the other side, and it has been passed out of the committee unanimously. And here it is held up deliberately.

I find it an outrage. I do not know what I can do about it. Obviously, Senators have rights and I respect those rights. They have a right to object. But, having the right to object and objecting for good reason are two different things. There should be a good reason to object. There is no good reason to object to a piece of legislation that has unanimous support.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## MARITIME SECURITY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have been working very hard to get a unanimous consent agreement on a major piece of legislation, maritime security. It, I think, is urgent we get this legislation passed. It has bipartisan support. It is a major move in making sure that we have an American merchant marine. It also actually would save money. We have worked very hard to accommodate all of the interests and clear up some concerns about this major legislation.

I had hoped we could get an agreement tonight that would allow us to complete action with a series of votes tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. It appears now that that may not be possible. I would like to announce now that there will be no further votes tonight. We will continue to work to see if we can get an agreement. We will have debate. Hopefully, we will get an agreement still tonight to have these stacked votes in the morning at 10 o'clock. We have not been able to reach that agreement.

Senator GRASSLEY has been here. He has made his statements. He has identified seven amendments that he is very interested in. We had an agreement that would have said that all debate on all amendments—we were trying to get an agreement that said seven amendments would be offered by Senator GRASSLEY, and if votes were necessary, they would all occur starting at 10 o'clock in the morning.

I think Senator GRASSLEY has had the opportunity to make his points on the bill in general. I know he would like to be heard on these amendments. I think that he has been reasonable in working out the framework of an agreement here, but we do not yet have it clear. But I think it is important we go ahead and notify Members there will not be additional votes tonight.

I will not make this unanimous consent request at this time. The distinguished manager of the bill on the Democratic side of the aisle, the great Senator from Hawaii, will be talking to Senators that are concerned.

I just want to emphasize, we are on the verge of passing major legislation. We have an agreement in hand that would limit the amendments, get it done, and get it to final passage. If we do not get this agreement tonight, I fear this bill will never get passed this year, because Senators will be leaving tomorrow around noon. If we cannot get the votes done tomorrow, if we are going to have seven votes—and we have no guarantee that we could even get those on Tuesday morning—plus on Tuesday of next week we are going to be very much into the continuing resolution debate. We need to get that done. That is the overall final agreement that will allow the Senate to leave for the year.

So I urge my colleagues, let us see if we can come to final closure on the

amendments and a series of votes at 10 o'clock in the morning. But I want to emphasize, no further votes tonight. We do not have an agreement at this point that we will definitely have votes at 10 o'clock in the morning but we will keep working on that. We will notify all Members through the rotary announcement and in every other way we can, but you should expect the possibility of votes in the morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. President, I now turn to a statement so that Senators can be checking with their colleagues and see if we can get an agreement on the unanimous consent request.

The Senate has been considering this afternoon the Maritime Security Act, H.R. 1350. I urge my colleagues, when we do get an agreement, if we get an agreement, to support this critically important national security legislation.

H.R. 1350 will ensure that our Nation and our Armed Forces will have available a modern fleet of vessels, and reliable, loyal American crews to provide a readily available sealift.

It also puts at the disposal of the Department of Defense vast intermodal and management transportation assets that are essential to modern military logistics.

For the Department of Defense to duplicate the capabilities this legislation will provide would cost \$800 million a year—eight times the yearly cost of the entire maritime security program.

So this legislation is quite simply a cost-effective bargain for our Nation's security. It is also essential.

If any of my colleagues were undecided on this legislation before the recent crisis in the Persian Gulf, they should not be now. What has happened in the last 2 weeks has demonstrated that we must be prepared and able to act on our own when our national interest so requires.

During the Persian Gulf war in 1990 and 1991, we had the support of a worldwide coalition with almost unlimited access to staging areas, to modern ports and infrastructure, and to vessels and crews of many nations. Even then, however, some foreign-flag vessels and crews refused to enter the Gulf, or it took weeks to decide whether they would sail or not—delays that could have been catastrophic in certain circumstances or in future conflicts. Still, with U.S.-flag ships and crews carrying nearly 80 percent of all the seaborne cargo, the job did get done and, frankly, done quite well.

During this recent crisis, however, we are seeing that our relatively good fortune in that war was probably the exception rather than what might be the rule in the future.

For example, according to press reports, every Arab State, even those on our side in 1990 and 1991, condemned the strikes on Saddam Hussein.

Our B-52 bombers had to fly the long way around—all the way from Louisiana to Guam to the Middle East—in